



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/295,966	04/21/1999	KOICHIRO IKUDOME	34503/WWM/A5	7800

23363 7590 05/13/2003

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD
SUITE 500
PASADENA, CA 91105

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

19

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 19

Application Number: 09/295,966

Filing Date: April 21, 1999

Appellant(s): Koichiro, Ikudome et al.

MAILED

MAY 13 2003

GROUP 3600

Wesley W. Monroe

For Appellant

Art Unit: 3621

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/02/2002.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-29 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Art Unit: 3621

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Horowitz et al. (WO96/05549). This rejection is set forth in the office action, paper # 9

WO96/05549

Horowitz et al.

2/1996

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Shiva Corp. Horowitz et al. (WO 96/05549).

As per claims 1, 8, 15, Horowitz discloses a system/method comprising:

a dial-up network server (or network server) that receives user IDs from user's computers (see., abstract);
a redirection server (a firewall or filter or gateway) to the dial-up network server, an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server (see., figs 1 and 2, page 3, lines 8-34 or col 3, lines 8-34, page 4, lines 1-34 or col 4, lines 1-34);

Art Unit: 3621

wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server

(see.,abstract, page 4, lines 23-34 or col 4, lines 23-34, page 8, lines 9-34 or col 8, lines 9-34);

wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server

(see.,abstract, page 7, lines 1-34 or col 7, lines 1-34, page 9, lines 4-34 or col 9, lines 4-34); and

wherein data redirected toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individual rule set (see., this limitation is disclosed by Horowitz, in the

abstract, specifically wherein it is stated that the server also includes processing electronics which

control the communication and network ports. The processing electronics also receive a user

identification string from the communication port. The string having been entered by a remote user

at a remote computer, and it identifies the remote user. The server uses the string to access a database

and determine at least one access filter associated with the string, please note that the process of

identifying the remote user is seen to read as the step of the users's computers rule set or portion of

rule set, and the step of redirecting server is also disclosed in page 4, lines 6-18, specifically wherein it

is stated that if the server locates an access filter for a remote user which indicates that the remote

user should-not have access to a particular zone or device, that remote user will not be allowed to

communicate with that zone or device regardless of the remote computer used in the attempt to gain

access. The remote user will, however, be able to communicate with other non-restricted parts of the

network, also please note that the fact that the remote user will be able to communicate with other

non-restricted parts of the network, thus the remote user in fact has been redirected toward another

direction).

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 2-6, 9-13, 16-29 Horowitz discloses the claimed limitation, wherein the redirection server (or filter) further provides control over a plurality of data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (see., abstract, page 9, lines 13-34 or col 9, lines 13-34).

As per claims 7, 14, Horowitz discloses the claimed limitation, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users's IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set (see., abstract, page 8, lines 28-34 or col 8, lines 28-34, page 9, lines 24-34 or col 9, lines 24-34).

(11) Response To Argument

In response to claims 1-29, Applicant argues that the prior art of record (Horowitz et al) does not teach or suggest: "user ID for one of the users' computers and wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individual rule set or rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address". However, these newly added limitations is also disclosed by Horowitz **in the abstract, specifically wherein it is stated that the server also includes processing electronics which control the communication and network ports. The processing electronics also receive a user identification string from the communication port. The string having been entered by a remote user at a remote computer, and it identifies the remote user. The server uses the string to access a database and determine at least one access filter associated with the string, please note that the process of identifying the remote user is seen to read as the step of the users's computers rule set or portion of rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address (network address or access filter associated with the string), and the step of redirecting server is also disclosed in page 4, lines 6-18, specifically**

Art Unit: 3621

wherein it is stated that if the server locates an access filter for a remote user which indicates that the remote user should-not have access to a particular zone or device, that remote user will not be allowed to communicate with that zone or device regardless of the remote computer used in the attempt to gain access. The remote user will, however, be able to communicate with other non-restricted parts of the network, also please note that the fact that the remote user will be able to communicate with other non-restricted parts of the network, thus the remote user in fact has been redirected toward another direction).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.



Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner

Christie, Parker & Hale, LLP


Post Office Box 7068

Pasadena, Ca 91109-7068


JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Respectfully submitted,


STEPHEN GRAVINI
PRIMARY EXAMINER


HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600